

# THE COLLINS CENTER UPDATE

Volume 12, Issue 4

July-September 2010



**THE CENTER FOR  
STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP  
U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA**



## INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- **Plotting a Future Course for the Reserve Component**
- **Professional Military Education Assistance to the Military Institute of the Moldovan Armed Forces**
- **Crisis & Contingency Response Planning in the Serbian Armed Forces**
- **In the Dark: Military Planning for a Catastrophic Critical Infrastructure Event**
- **Multilateral Approaches to Regional Challenges: The Fifth Annual USARCENT Land Forces Symposium**

### **PLOTTING A FUTURE COURSE FOR THE RESERVE COMPONENT**

**Professor Bert B. Tussing**

*Director, Homeland Defense and Security Issues Branch, CSL*

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs (ASD-RA), the Honorable Dennis McCarthy, was already ahead of the task, but his initiative was reiterated by direction of the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR):

*Conduct a comprehensive review of the future role of the Reserve Component, including an examination of the balance between active and reserve.*

Behind the terse rhetoric of the tasking was a more important issue in the mind of Secretary McCarthy. For years, consideration of active and reserve component employment was most frequently a matter of reinforcement. If the active component were over-tasked, their Service Reserve and National Guard counterparts could be called into service. Traditionally, this was an option not frequently exercised; but given the operational tempo that has characterized the military since 9/11, the comfortable notion of the Reserve Component (RC) serving as a "strategic reserve" has been upended.

Were that not so, however, the Secretary was of an opinion that the paradigm was still flawed. The question should not be: "How can the RC backfill?" The question should be: "What component of the Total Force package can best fill a given requirement?" By approaching requirements in this fashion, the best effectiveness and greater efficiencies could be realized by the military, whether in garrison or deployed, in defense or in civil support.

Based on that vision, McCarthy asked the Homeland Defense and Security Issues Branch of the U.S. Army War College's Center for Strategic Leadership to convene a series of forums to examine those areas where the Guard and Reserve represented the best of the Total Force to respond to future requirements. The first forum took place in December 2009, for the purpose of

understanding the perceived joint operating environment in 2020, and developing broad visions of how the RC could transform its roles and missions to best support the Total Force in achieving national security objectives. In pursuit of the same, and in keeping with the vision espoused by the Joint Forces Command's *Joint Operating Environment* and its *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations*, participants directed their discussions around four mission categories that are projected to comprise the future operating environment: Combat, Engagement, Security, and Relief and Reconstruction.

Participants suggested several "models" of the Reserve Component that could be applied to fulfill these broad mission areas to varying degrees of efficiency, which were subsequently presented to the Service Reserve Component Chiefs and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau at a conference facilitated by CSL at the Alfred M. Gray Marine Corps Research Center, Quantico, VA. After gaining insights and directions from the Chiefs, the Secretary's initiative (now with further direction from the QDR) led to another conference in Carlisle, which took place at Collins Hall at Carlisle Barracks on 21 and 22 July.

This third function concentrated on five of the six objectives taken from the QDR's "charter" to ASD-RA:

- Determine how to use RC capabilities and capacities to best advantage
- Determine those roles for which the Guard and Reserve are well suited to be considered as a force of first choice
- Postulate conditions and standards that would provide a trained and ready RC
- Recommend an Active Component/RC mix to meet COCOM demands and present a cost benefit analysis for proposals toward the same
- Address laws, policies and doctrinal changes that would be required to meet the postulated demands and conditions

In working to meet these objectives, ASD-RA sought to build a "business case" for utilization of the RC in support of the

<b>Report Documentation Page</b>			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
<p>Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p>				
1. REPORT DATE <b>SEP 2010</b>	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED <b>00-07-2010 to 00-09-2010</b>		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>The Collins Center Update. Volume 12, Issue 4. July-Spetember 2010</b>			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>U.S. Army War College,Center for Strategic Leadership,650 Wright Avenue ,Carlisle,PA,17013-5049</b>			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>4</b>
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	

National Security Strategy. In so doing, he hoped to determine if current RC policy and guidance is adequate in support of the business case, and associated employment considerations that impact interaction between the RC, their civilian employers, and the AC. In that regard, the Secretary McCarthy hoped the July forum could open the discussion of developing methodologies to better manage involuntary mobilizations to meet requirements, and assess the cost/benefit of continued access to and use of the RC in an operational role.

The conference examined four mechanisms potentially available to the RC to build and support the envisioned business case: Individual Augmentation; Rotating Operational RC Forces (at home and abroad); establishing specialized Military Engagement Teams; and supporting the AC through Institutional Support provided and sustained by the RC. Benefits and shortcomings of each of these mechanisms were determined and evaluated by four working groups, and their recommendations were forwarded to OASD-RA.

All three events outlined above were directed in support of OASD-RA in fulfillment of a need formally recognized by the QDR. The final report required of the office by the Review will be due at the end of November 2010. Vetting of the same will take place in December and January, followed by a series of Collaborative Analysis Workshops to be conducted at Johns Hopkins University. For information on these follow-on efforts, and intermediately activities in support of the same, contact Prof. Bert Tussing at [bert.tussing@us.army.mil](mailto:bert.tussing@us.army.mil).

---

## CSL

---

### PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE MILITARY INSTITUTE OF THE MOLDOVAN ARMED FORCES

By **John F. Troxell**

*Operations and Gaining Division, CSL*

The Professional Military Education (PME) enhancement program at the Moldovan Military Institute is in support of the agreed NATO action plan with Moldova, pursuant to the Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP), and per the Moldovan Ministry of Defense (MOD) request for professional military education assistance. This program has also been reviewed and approved during the U.S. – Moldova BDC (Bilateral

Defense Consultation), January 2010 and supports Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and EUCOM security cooperation programs. The near term objective of the program is to assist the Moldovan Armed Forces Military Institute in development of officer basic course (lieutenants) and senior course (majors and lieutenant colonels) curriculum as well as in faculty development and teaching methodologies. In a broader sense, this effort supports the NATO Education and Training for Defence Reform Initiative and the U.S. Warsaw Initiative Fund (WIF) focus area on Defense Institution Building and Professional Defense Education. Activities are funded by NATO, NATO members and partners, the Partnership for Peace (PfP) Consortium, and EUCOM. This program is currently focused on producing, by March 2011 for accreditation by the Ministry of Education with implementation by September 2011, new NATO/Western oriented basic and senior officer courses and providing parallel faculty development assistance. The reform of the Moldovan armed forces education system, to include improved curriculum and teaching methodologies, will contribute to the complete transformation of their military. Such a transformation will lead to sound decision making on the part of future military leaders, greater participation and cooperative capability with NATO and European Union (EU) forces, and strengthened relationships between the Republic of Moldova and NATO members and partners.

Following an initial assessment visit by a NATO team in January 2009, and several subsequent engagements, the leadership of the MOD and the Military Institute decided to completely transform their PME program. The focus of this effort is to modernize the existing curriculum for the Basic Course (4 year pre-commissioning program), and to develop a new Senior Officer Course (majors and lieutenant colonels). The Basic Course is designed as a four year course resulting in the commissioning of new lieutenants in the Armed Forces of Moldova, along with awarding a Level I Bachelor's degree. The primary specialty is Military Science and the second specialty is Organizational Management. The Senior Course is designed to build on the foundation of the redesigned basic course and be conducted over the course of one year, including 60 credit hours, and result in the education of senior military leaders and civilians to enable them to lead military units and serve in national security

structures. This program would also result in the award of a level II master's degree. The goal is to complete academic plans for both courses by the end of March 2011 for submission to the Ministry of Education (MOE) for accreditation. As the curriculum is being reviewed by the MOE, the Military Institute will continue to actively train and prepare their faculty to begin to present the new curricula in September 2011.

In a cooperative effort with the Military Institute staff and the MOD, the NATO assistance team developed a proposed Action Plan for FY 11. This plan includes proposals for various academic related curriculum development and lecture sessions, as well as the need for various activities related to the specific military topics incorporated in this curriculum, to ensure that these topics are oriented on NATO standards and tactics, techniques and procedures. There are also recommendations for several familiarization visits by curriculum developers at the Military Institute to visit comparable PME organizations in the United States and Romania. These visits will facilitate the development of formal partnership relationships with appropriate western PME organizations. These partnerships will provide important assistance to complete the development process, and will remain critical to sustain the development of inherent capacities at the Military Institute. This Action Plan has been reviewed with the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, the appropriate offices in OSD(P), EUCOM, the country team in Moldova, and NATO's International and Military Staff's. A more detailed overview of the program and action plan is available by clicking on the chart.

In addition to providing the academic co-lead for this project, several members of the faculty have already provided support as PME topic SME's, teaching methodologies experts, and are programmed to continue these efforts. The war college is also supporting similar PME projects in Kazakhstan (Dr. Alan Stolberg academic co-lead), and Afghanistan (Colonel Jerry Cashion academic co-lead). In addition, Dr. Craig Nation serves as the co-chair of the greater Black Sea Area Working Group which is examining the possibility of establishing a Black Sea Defense College. Finally, Lieutenant Colonel Vince Lindenmeyer is serving as the project-lead for the Pre-commissioning level team for a NATO sponsored effort to publish a Generic PME Curriculum. For years, the

war college has been providing support to the operational force in the form of subject matter experts engaging with allies and friends. The PME efforts highlighted here are of a degree and sophistication above the normal SME visits. The PME programs being supported by USAWC are designed to assist partner nations in their efforts to transform their PME programs, and thus contribute to a long term change in the culture and orientation of these military forces. The PME enhancement program is in direct support of the objective specified in the 2010 QDR to build the security capacity of partner states, with the appropriate emphasis on the development of "professionalization of partner military forces." In support of this national objective, the war college is serving as a center of excellence for professional military education, and is being recognized as such throughout NATO and across an increasing number of nations.

## — CSL —

### CRISIS & CONTINGENCY RESPONSE PLANNING IN THE SERBIAN ARMED FORCES

**Professor Bernard F. Griffard**

Operations and Gaming Division, CSL

The crisis action planning (CAP) process is designed to support a commander's efforts to develop, analyze, select and implement a military course of action within a constrained timeframe. It is applicable whether in response to a national security threat or for Defense Support to Civilian Authorities (DSCA) in response to natural or manmade disasters. It is a critical skill that military planners must hone in order to be prepared for an actual event. Aware of this fact the Serbian Ministry of Defense requested that the Office of Defense Cooperation, U.S. Embassy Belgrade, develop a CAP workshop for members of the General Staff, Serbian Armed Forces (GSSAF).

In support of the Commander, U.S. European Command's (USEUCOM) Military-to-Military (M2M) initiatives, the U.S. Army War College (USAWC) provided a Traveling Contact Team (TCT), Professor Bernard Griffard, CSL; Colonel Mike Chesney, DCLM; and Lieutenant Colonel Gregory Hillebrand, DMSPO, to conduct a Crisis & Contingency Response Planning Workshop for the GSSAF and other Defense planners 9-10 September 2010 in Belgrade, Serbia. The purpose of

the workshop was to provide an overview of the U.S., crisis action planning process and military disaster response planning methodology and procedures, increasing SAF security preparedness and their ability to assist civil authorities in times of natural disaster or crisis.

Workshop participants included 25 Army and Air Force officers ranging in rank captain through colonel. These planners represented the J5, GSSAF, the Joint Operations Command (JOC), and representatives from the individual Service staffs. Throughout the workshop these individual officers exhibited a good grasp of the techniques required when planning within a constrained timeframe. With the 2006 dissolution of the Serbia and Montenegro Federation, the SAF lost its naval capabilities. The existent Riverine Force belongs to the Ministry of the Interior. Given the topic of the workshop, a valid critique of the participant makeup was the absence of representatives from outside the Ministry of Defense.

The format used for the workshop (information briefings followed by a practical exercise) was received enthusiastically by the participants. In addition to preventing "death by PowerPoint," it gave them a chance to study a problem within a constrained timeframe, formulate a recommendation, and then brief that recommendation. For the Team it stimulated the give and take of the discussion and maintained a high level of participant interest throughout.

For the USAWC, participation in Combatant Command TCT events supports the operational force. It allows USAWC faculty functional and regional specialists to stay current in their area of interest at minimal cost to the College.

### — CSL — IN THE DARK: MILITARY PLANNING FOR A CATASTROPHIC CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE EVENT

**Professor William Waddell**

Director, Command and Control Group, CSL

At this moment our nation is woefully unprepared for large scale, long-term, cataclysmic events, according to a Report of the Joint Defense Science Board/Threat Reduction Advisory Committee Task Force on *The Nuclear Weapons Effects National Enterprise*. A recent Report of the Defense

Science Board on *Unconventional Operational Concepts and the Homeland* stated that: "DoD [Department of Defense] will be called on to provide support to the civil government, but its activities can also progress to a leadership role in response, and consequence management efforts if and when the scope of attack is sufficiently severe." However, the report further declared that: "...DoD leadership, both civilian and military, has been slow to accept this apparently expanded scope of responsibilities because with it comes significant resource demands and financial costs that are not likely to be adequately supported."

Ignoring the potential problems associated with catastrophic critical infrastructure failure is no longer an option. Understanding the role of the DoD, and the need for initial planning and pre-event preparation for such an event is key to the integration of civil/military coordination in the case of an extreme infrastructure failure. To that end, the Command, Control, and Cyberspace Operations Group of the Center for Strategic Leadership at the U.S. Army War College held a workshop entitled, *In the Dark: Military Planning for a Catastrophic Critical Infrastructure Event*, at the Collins Center from 28-30 September 2010.

The purpose of this workshop was to begin discussions between the appropriate parties and outline the requirements for coordination and preparation for pre-event, initial response, and post-event survival of military facilities and their surrounding civilian communities. Nationally renowned plenary speakers set the scene, addressing the current state of readiness, the threat, and current military preparedness for such an event. Workshop participants addressed issues specific to pre-event, response, and post-event planning, and developed a series of recommendations concerning the requirements of DoD, other interagency partners, and first responders. Of note was the cross cutting issues that emerged in each workshop group indicating that DoD would first and foremost be focused on national defense, meaning that a catastrophic attack would put more emphasis on local jurisdictions to prepare for the aftermath of the attack. Additionally, the requirement for the reestablishment of electric power and communications systems for recovery was a common theme throughout the workshop.

The intended product of the workshop is a better recognition of the current and emerging Army and DoD requirements in

the area of preparation, and the development of a standardized approach and process for military-civilian interaction in line with the National Response Framework. Recommendations for preparation to all parties (government and private sector) will be included and provided as a written workshop report to senior leaders.

## — CSL —

### MULTILATERAL APPROACHES TO REGIONAL CHALLENGES: THE FIFTH ANNUAL USARCENT LAND FORCES SYMPOSIUM

**Professor Bernard F. Griffard**

*Operations and Gaming Division, CSL*

The Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army (CSA) and the Commander, Third U.S. Army/U.S. Army Central (USARCENT) hosted the Fifth Annual Land Forces Symposium (LFS) in Columbus and Fort Benning, GA, August 1-4, 2010. A valuable theater initiative, the LFS brings together Land Forces' leaders from throughout the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) area of responsibility (AOR) to discuss common challenges, exchange views and foster security cooperation while strengthening relationships among partner nations. In a groundbreaking move, this year's symposium conducted a parallel Senior Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) program to impress on the attendees the key role these soldiers play in the Land Forces training and leadership. Participating AOR

countries included in the primary audience and/or in the parallel Senior NCO program included Afghanistan, Bahrain, Egypt, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tajikistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, and Yemen.

Lieutenant General William G. Webster, Commander, Third U.S. Army/USARCENT, was the principal host for this event. Co-host CSA General George W. Casey, Jr. met with the delegates and delivered remarks at the 2 August dinner conducted at the U.S. Army Infantry Museum, Ft. Benning, GA. General J.D. Thurman, Commander, U.S. Forces Command (USFORSCOM), delivered the Keynote Address during the opening session on 1 August. Major General Michael Ferriter, Commander, Ft. Benning and the Maneuver Center of Excellence, hosted the symposium attendees at Ft. Benning on 3 August where they viewed basic infantry training, a firepower demonstration and the Rangers in Action.

This year's LFS overarching theme was Multilateral Approaches to Regional Challenges. This topic was addressed through three panels: Consequence Management/Critical Infrastructure Protection; Regional Security Challenges; and, Security Cooperation Programs. In addition two regional breakout sessions were conducted to elicit frank comments as to the value of the LFS and to identify regional topics of interest for future discussion.

In support of this Army Service Component effort the U. S. Army War



BG Barak Charbel, Lebanon (L), and BG Mohamed Salem Ali Jaradat, Jordan, participate in the panel Q & A

College (USAWC) Center for Strategic Leadership (CSL) provided Professor Bernard F. Griffard and Professor Richard L. Winslow to perform moderator duties. For the fifth year in a row, Professor Griffard acted as the symposium moderator and as a panel moderator. He also facilitated the Central Asia South Asia (CASA) regional breakout session. Dr. Winslow moderated the "Regional Security Challenges" panel and facilitated the Levant and Arabian Gulf/ Peninsula regional breakout session.

Events such as the LFS provide a venue for informal approaches between the participants. From a strategic perspective, this year's LFS stimulated real discussion of regional threats and requirements among the delegates. It was refreshing to see the regional speakers identify serious threats that need to be addressed from a regional perspective. Once this door was opened, there was open discussion as to the application of possible solutions.

*This and other CSL publications can be obtained free of charge online at: <http://www.csl.army.mil>*

## COLLINS CENTER UPDATE - FALL 2010

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE  
Center for Strategic Leadership  
650 Wright Avenue  
Carlisle, PA 17013-5049  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
650 Wright Avenue  
Carlisle, PA 17013-5049